

MINUTES of the meeting of Planning Committee held at The Shire Hall, St Peter's Square Hereford HR1 2HX on Wednesday 25 March 2015 at 10.00 am

Present: Councillor PGH Cutter (Chairman)
Councillor PA Andrews (Vice Chairman)

Councillors: AJM Blackshaw, WLS Bowen, EMK Chave, PJ Edwards,
DW Greenow, KS Guthrie, J Hardwick, JW Hope MBE, PJ McCaull, FM Norman,
J Norris and DB Wilcox

In attendance: Councillors H Bramer, PM Morgan and GJ Powell

193. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors JLV Kenyon, JG Lester, RI Matthews, RL Mayo and TL Widdows.

194. NAMED SUBSTITUTES

In accordance with paragraph 4.1.23 of the Council's Constitution, Councillor WLS Bowen attended the meeting as a substitute member for Councillor RI Matthews.

195. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Agenda item 11 – 150373 – The Laurels, Wellington, Hereford

Mr M Willimont, Head of Development Management and Environmental Health declared a pecuniary interest as he was the applicant and left the meeting for the duration of this item.

196. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the meetings held on 4 March 2015 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

197. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman reported that Mr P Mullineux, Senior Planning Officer, was leaving the authority. He thanked him, on behalf of the Committee, for his hard work in dealing with a number of difficult applications presented to the Committee.

198. APPEALS

The Planning Committee noted the report.

199. 143517 LAND ADJOINING COURTLANDS FARM, WINFORTON, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR3 6EA

(Proposal for 7 no. Dwellings with garages and parking.)

The Senior Planning Officer gave a presentation on the application, and updates/additional representations received following the publication of the agenda were provided in the update sheet, as appended to these Minutes.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr K Goodman, of Eardisley Group Parish Council, spoke in opposition to the Scheme. Mrs Y King, a local resident, spoke in objection.

In accordance with paragraph 4.8.2.2 of the Council's Constitution, the local ward member, Councillor JW Hope MBE, spoke on the application.

He commented on a number of issues including:

- The proposed access to the site was not the one which the Parish Council had criticised in its objection.
- There were only twelve letters of objection which was a low percentage of the relevant population.
- There was adequate drainage.
- The School had capacity.
- The development was not of a high density; the reduction from a proposal for 13 dwellings to 7 dwellings was welcome.

In the Committee's discussion of the application the following principal points were made:

- Although the reduction in the number of dwellings brought some benefits to those living nearby it did mean that the developer was not required to enter into a Section 106 agreement or provide any affordable housing. The Development Manager confirmed that should the developer wish to increase the number of dwellings a further application would be required and S106 considerations could apply.
- The proposed development had many good features. It was a small scale development which would benefit the village.
- There were no grounds for refusal and weight needed to be given to the Council's lack of a five year housing land supply.
- Traffic speed on the A438 was of particular concern. It was asked whether the developer could be encouraged, working with the Parish Council, to contribute to measures to slow traffic down. In response it was noted that an informative could be added to this effect.
- In relation to the use of speed indicator devices the Transportation Manager confirmed that the Council's policy was not to install permanent devices. The Development Manager also confirmed that no condition could be imposed to extend double white lines to prevent overtaking at the location.
- The site had been proposed for development in the draft Eardisley Neighbourhood Plan.
- The hope was expressed that pedestrian access could be improved.
- It was requested that the quality of building and energy efficiency measures should be to the highest standard.
- A concern was expressed about drainage. In response the Senior Planning Officer commented that the site was not in the flood plain. There had been no objections from Welsh Water or the Land Drainage Manager and appropriate conditions were recommended.

The local ward member was given the opportunity to close the debate. He reiterated his comment about access to the site, noting that the majority of the road at the location already had double white line marking and that speed indicator devices were used.

RESOLVED: That officers named in the Scheme of Delegation to Officers be authorised to grant full planning permission, subject to the conditions below and any other further conditions considered necessary.

1. **A01 Time limit for commencement (full permission)**
2. **B01 Development in accordance with the approved plans**
 - Amended block plan - drawing number 1412/S/1A
 - Amended elevations and floor plans - Plots 1, 2 and 4 - drawing number 1412.12
 - Amended elevations and floor plans - Plot 3 - drawing number 1412/14
 - Amended elevations and floor plans - Plots 5 and 7 - drawing number 1412/15
 - Amended elevations and floor plans - Plot 6 - drawing number 1412/1G
 - Amended garage and elevations and floor plan - drawing number 1412/17
3. **CAB Visibility splays, (access lane(2.4) (105) metres to the west, 85 metres to the east)**
- 4 **F14 Removal of permitted development rights**
- 5 **C01 Sample of external materials**
- 6 **D04 Details of window sections, eaves, verges and barge boards**
- 7 **D05 Details of external joinery finishes**
- 8 **D10 Specification of guttering and downpipes**
- 9 **G09 Details of boundary treatments (Detail will also be included with regards to boundary treatments between individual dwellings which will not be of close boarded fencing.**
- 10 **G10 Landscaping scheme**
- 11 **G11 Landscaping scheme implementation (11)**
- 12 **Prior to commencement of the development, a habitat enhancement plan integrated with any landscape proposals must be submitted to, and be approved in writing by, the local planning authority, and the work shall be implemented as approved. An appropriately qualified and experienced ecological clerk of works must be appointed (or consultant engaged in that capacity) to oversee the ecological mitigation work.**

Reason: To ensure that all species are protected having regard to the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 and Policies NC1, NC6, NC7, NC8 and NC9 of the Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan in relation to Nature Conservation and Biodiversity and to meet the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and the NERC Act 2006
- 13 **CCO Site Waste Management**

- 14 **CBK Restriction of hours during construction**
- 15 **CCK Details of slab levels**
- 16 **L04 - Comprehensive & Integrated drainage of site which must include reference to the location of any soakaways and demonstrate how the development will ensure no increased risk to people and property up to the 1 in 100 year event. The drainage strategy must demonstrate that exceedance of the drainage system has been adequately considered and that suitable mitigation is included to prevent an unacceptable risk of flooding to the development or existing properties and Information regarding the proposed adoption and maintenance of the drainage systems.**
17. **No development shall commence on site until the developer has prepared a detailed surface water drainage design, with supporting calculations, showing the location and sizes of any soakaways, demonstrating how discharges from the site are restricted to no greater than pre-developed rates between the 1 in 1 year and 1 in 100 year events (with climate change allowance), and demonstrating that no flooding from the drainage system will occur up to the 1 in 30 year event. A detailed foul water drainage design, with supporting calculations, showing the location of the proposed package treatment plant and soakaway. Evidence of infiltration testing in accordance with BRE365 at locations of proposed soakaways to support the design. Groundwater levels should also be provided as Standing Advice indicating the invert levels of soakaways are a minimum of 1m above the groundwater level.**

Reason: To ensure effective drainage facilities are provided for the development as indicated and to ensure that no adverse impacts occurs to the environment and to comply with Policies DR4 and CF2 of the Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

INFORMATIVES:

- 1 **The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against planning policy and any other material considerations. Negotiations in respect of matters of concern with the application (as originally submitted) have resulted in amendments to the proposal. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.**
- 2 **N11A**
- 3 **N11C**
- 4 **The applicant is encouraged to work with the Parish Council to provide a traffic calming measure at the entrance to the village.**

200. 143683 THE OLDE SHOP, BISHOPS FROME, HEREFORDSHIRE, WR6 5BP

(Proposed erection of two dwellings with garages.)

The Acting Principal Planning Officer gave a presentation on the application, and updates/additional representations received following the publication of the agenda were provided in the update sheet, as appended to these Minutes.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Ms C Sincock, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application. Mr B Thomas, the applicant's agent, spoke in support.

In accordance with paragraph 4.8.2.2 of the Council's Constitution, the local ward member, Councillor PM Morgan, spoke on the application.

She commented on a number of issues including:

- The Parish Council supported the application. The development was a small development in line with the Bishop's Frome Neighbourhood Plan.
- She acknowledged the concerns expressed that the development could set a precedent and lead to further applications for backfill and garden developments which would begin to have an adverse effect. However, the particular application had a relatively minor impact and privacy of neighbours was protected.
- She noted that the road was subject to flooding and urged that the conditions relating to drainage ensured an enhancement of the present situation.

In the Committee's discussion of the application the following principal points were made:

- The impact on the Grade II listed Broadfield Court was discussed. The Acting Principal Planning Officer confirmed that Broadfield Court was approximately 100 metres away and separated in part from the proposed development by another small residential development.
- The Parish Council supported the development which was consistent with the draft Neighbourhood Plan.
- Concern was expressed about the impact of garden developments on the character and setting of settlements and the loss of open green space within settlements. It was suggested that the Committee needed to bear this in mind when considering such applications.

The local ward member was given the opportunity to close the debate. She reiterated her request for enhancement of the drainage in the location and requested that landscaping also provided enhancement, ensuring privacy and preserving the character of the area.

The Development Manager commented that the development created no additional harm to the setting and represented the organic growth that the Committee had indicated it favoured. The protection of open space within settlements was an important consideration. Progressing the Neighbourhood Plan to Regulation 16 stage, at which point material weight could be given to the Plan, would be an important means of securing such protection.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

- 1. C01 – Planning permission**
- 2. C06 – Development in accordance with approved plans**
- 3. C13 – Samples of external materials**

4. **Foul water and surface water discharges shall be drained separately from the site.**

Reason: To protect the integrity of the public sewerage system and to comply with Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan policies DR2, DR4, DR7 and CF1.

5. **No surface water shall be allowed to connect, either directly or indirectly, to the public sewerage system unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: To prevent hydraulic overloading of the public sewerage system, to protect the health and safety of existing residents and ensure no detriment to the environment and to comply with Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan policies DR2, DR4, DR7 and CF1.

6. **Land drainage run-off shall not be permitted to discharge, either directly or indirectly, into the public sewerage system.**

Reason: To prevent hydraulic overload of the public sewerage system and pollution of the environment and to comply with Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan policies DR2, DR4, DR7 and CF1.

7. **C65 – Removal of Permitted Development Rights**

8. **C67 – No new windows**

9. **The recommendations of Swift Ecology's Preliminary Ecological Report dated October 2014 and supplementary Great Crested Newt appraisal dated February 2015 should be followed. Prior to commencement of the development, a precautionary species mitigation and habitat enhancement scheme should be submitted to and be approved in writing by the local planning authority, and the scheme shall be implemented as approved.**

Reasons: To ensure that all species are protected having regard to the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, the NERC Act 2006 and Policies NC1, NC6, NC7, NC8 and NC9 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

10. **C95 – Details of Boundary treatments**

11. **C96 – Landscaping scheme**

12. **C97 – Landscaping scheme implementation**

13. **CAC – Visibility over frontage**

14. **CAL – Access, turning area and parking**

15. **CAZ – Parking for site operatives**

16. **CBO – Scheme of surface water drainage**

17. **CBP – Scheme of surface water regulation**

INFORMATIVES:

- 1. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against planning policy and any other material considerations, including any representations that have been received. It has subsequently determined to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.**
- 2. N11A**
- 3. N11C**

201. 143820 SEFTON COTTAGE, VOWCHURCH, HEREFORD, HR2 0RL

(Proposed subservient single storey self contained annexe, ancillary to existing dwelling house.)

The Development Manager gave a presentation on the application, and updates/additional representations received following the publication of the agenda were provided in the update sheet, as appended to these Minutes.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr P Mason, of Vowchurch Parish Council, spoke in opposition to the Scheme. Mrs Prosser-Painting, the applicant, spoke in support.

In accordance with paragraph 4.8.2.2 of the Council's Constitution, the local ward member, Councillor GJ Powell, spoke on the application.

He commented on a number of issues including:

- He agreed with the Parish Council's view on the application. There would be no objection to an extension. However, what was proposed was not an extension but a new, self-contained, detached permanent dwelling in the open countryside.
- He referred to the description of the application at paragraph 1.3 of the report and the officer's appraisal at paragraph 6.1 of the report which considered the principle of the development to be broadly acceptable in the context of Policy H7 – housing in the countryside outside settlements, on the basis that the annexe represented ancillary accommodation not a new dwelling. He questioned that appraisal.
- The intention to use the building to provide accommodation for the applicant's mother to enable the family to provide her with care was not relevant to the application.
- He questioned how a proposed condition, requiring the functioning of the annexe to be ancillary to the use of the main dwelling to avoid the potential establishment of a new dwelling, could be enforced.
- There was concern that approval of the application could set a precedent encouraging further similar developments.

In the Committee's discussion of the application the following principal points were made:

- It was appropriate to give consideration to meeting social need and the applicant's wish to provide care to a relative. These were exceptional circumstances.
- The annexe was of good design and would not be intrusive.
- It was noted that circumstances could change and asked what options were available to ensure that the annexe remained tied to the main dwelling. It was also asked

whether permitted development rights could be removed. The Development Manager commented that a condition could be imposed or a section 106 agreement drawn up to tie the annexe to the dwelling. A condition could be imposed to remove permitted development rights.

- The objections to the development were overstated.
- It could be argued that the scheme represented new development and would set a precedent.
- There was a view that an engineering solution could be found permitting the provision of an extension to the existing property to which there would be no objection.

The local ward member was given the opportunity to close the debate. He reiterated that the proposal represented a new dwelling. No needs assessment had been produced providing evidence of social need. This should be provided in such cases if an application were to be supported on those grounds. The development would have a visible impact on the landscape.

The Development Manager commented that at 67sq metres the development was small and was correctly viewed as an annexe. It was only slightly larger than a building that could be constructed without planning permission. Providing support to a family member was a ground for granting planning permission. A section 106 agreement could be entered into, to tie the annexe to the house, and a condition imposed to remove permitted development rights.

RESOLVED: That subject to completion of a Section 106 Town and County Planning Act 1990 planning obligation agreement (to ensure the new annexe is tied to the existing dwelling) on terms to be agreed by officers named in the Scheme of Delegation to Officers, after consultation with the Chairman, officers are authorised to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions stated below, and any other further conditions considered necessary by officers, including a condition removing permitted development rights:

1. **A01 Time limit for commencement (full permission)**
2. **B02 Development in accordance with approved plans and materials**
3. **F28 Occupation ancillary to existing dwelling only (granny annexes)**
4. **I16 Restriction of hours during construction**

INFORMATIVES:

1. **The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against planning policy and any other material considerations, including any representations that have been received. It has subsequently determined to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.**

202. P141368/O LAND AT CASTLE END, LEA, ROSS-ON-WYE, HEREFORDSHIRE

(Proposed site for 14 new residential properties to include 5 no. Affordable properties, vehicle turning and landscaping.)

The Development Manager gave a presentation on the application, and updates/additional representations received following the publication of the agenda were provided in the update sheet, as appended to these Minutes.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr P Fountain, Vice-Chairman of Lea Parish Council, spoke in opposition to the Scheme. Mr S Banner, Chairman of Lea Action Group and Mr M Lowe, a local resident, spoke in objection. Mr J Kendrick, the applicant's agent, spoke in support.

In accordance with paragraph 4.8.2.2 of the Council's Constitution, the local ward member, Councillor H Bramer, spoke on the application.

He commented on a number of issues including:

- On 11 February 2015 the Committee had refused an application for 38 dwellings on the grounds that this would represent overdevelopment. Planning permission had already been granted for 48 new dwellings in Lea village which consisted of 218 dwellings. This represented a 25% increase in the size of the village.
- He was concerned about highway safety. People using a proposed footpath alongside the A40 to the proposed pedestrian crossing would be very vulnerable, including Children who would have to use the crossing to get to school. He was also concerned about the safety of the access off the A40 itself. Traffic speeds exceeded the 30mph limit. The visibility splay to the north was insufficient.
- The development would have an adverse effect on the landscape.
- The footpath by which residents would have to access the village would not be pleasant to use because of its narrow width and proximity to the A40.
- The proposed site was the worst possible location in the village for new houses. It was not a sustainable development.

In the Committee's discussion of the application the following principal points were made:

- The development for which permission had already been granted in Lea exceeded the growth target over the period of the Core Strategy. The development was not sustainable.
- The Parish Council and Lea Action Group were opposed to the development. There had also been 57 letters of objection.
- There were considerable highway safety concerns presented by the A40. A driver would have great difficulty seeing pedestrians using the proposed pedestrian crossing unless a hedge including trees could be entirely removed. There was concern too about backing up of traffic towards a blind bend on the A40.
- The development would have an adverse impact on Castle End, a grade II* listed dwelling.
- There were landscaping issues. The Conservation Manager (Historic Buildings) had commented in the report that the retention of the rural landscape adjacent to Castle End Farm would be fundamentally preferred.
- The Council's lack of a five year housing land supply was the only reason the application had been brought forward.

The Development Manager commented that following the examination in public of the Core Strategy the indicative growth target was likely to increase as it would be based upon growth within Lea Parish not in Lea village. Growth targets across the County would likewise increase to enable the County to meet its housing targets. In addition there would be no cap on development. If an application were acceptable it would

proceed. It was for the Neighbourhood Plan to identify specific development sites within villages and that was why it was important that these plans were progressed to Regulation 16 stage. The proposed development was at the edge of the village and had access to its facilities. He cautioned against refusal on highway grounds.

The Transportation Manager stated that sight lines met the Manual for Streets 2 standards; the 85 percentile speed measurements were satisfactory; and the accident data that he had access to, which was prior to 2013, showed 2 accidents on the A40 in the locality but no accidents near the development site.

It was acknowledged that officer advice was that there was no objection on highway safety grounds and some Members suggested this should not be advanced as a ground for refusal. However, many Members, several of whom had attended a site inspection, remained concerned about safety and the risk of accidents.

It was proposed that the application should be refused on the grounds that the proposal would have an adverse impact on a Grade II* listed building (which is a significant heritage asset), highway safety concerns, landscaping concerns, and concerns about sustainability on the basis that the scheme would represent overdevelopment of Lea village.

The local ward member was given the opportunity to close the debate. He reiterated his opposition to the development.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be refused and officers named in the Scheme of Delegation to Officers be authorised to finalise the drafting of the reasons for refusal for publication based on the Committee's view that the proposal would have an adverse impact on a Grade II* listed building (which is a significant heritage asset), highway safety concerns, landscaping concerns, concerns regarding sustainability and on the basis that the scheme would represent overdevelopment of Lea village.

203. 150373 THE LAURELS, WELLINGTON, HEREFORD, HR4 8AT

(Proposed one and half storey extension (garden room reinstated after extension.)

The Planning Officer gave a presentation on the application, and updates/additional representations received following the publication of the agenda were provided in the update sheet, as appended to these Minutes. She reported that Wellington Parish Council had confirmed that it had no objection to the application.

In accordance with paragraph 4.8.2.2 of the Council's Constitution, the local ward member, Councillor AJM Blackshaw, spoke on the application.

He commented that the application was a straightforward application for an extension to a house in keeping with the property.

The Committee noted that the extension was subservient and that materials to be used were in keeping with the property and that there had been no objections to the proposal.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

- 1. A01 Time limit for commencement (full permission)**
- 2. B02 Development in accordance with approved plans and materials**

3. **C01 Samples of external materials**
4. **D09 Details of rooflights**
5. **D05 Details of external joinery finishes**
6. **D10 Specification of guttering and downpipes**
- 7 **I16 Hours of construction**

Informative:

1. **The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against planning policy and any other material considerations, including any representations that have been received. It has subsequently determined to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.**

204. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The Planning Committee noted the date of the next meeting.

Appendix 1- Schedule of Updates

The meeting ended at 1.02 pm

CHAIRMAN

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: 25 March 2015

Schedule of Committee Updates/Additional Representations

Note: The following schedule represents a summary of the additional representations received following the publication of the agenda and received up to midday on the day before the Committee meeting where they raise new and relevant material planning considerations.

SCHEDULE OF COMMITTEE UPDATES

143517 - PROPOSAL FOR 7 NO. DWELLINGS WITH GARAGES AND PARKING AT LAND ADJOINING COURTLANDS FARM, WINFORTON, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR3 6EA

For: Mr & Mrs Crump per John Needham, 22 Broad Street, Ludlow, Shropshire, SY8 1NG

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

The applicants have recently submitted an ecology report which the Conservation Manager, (Ecology) has assessed and raises no objections subject to a condition to provide habitat enhancement.

CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

Replace condition number 12 as attached to the Committee report with the following condition:

Prior to commencement of the development, a habitat enhancement plan integrated with any landscape proposals must be submitted to, and be approved in writing by, the local planning authority, and the work shall be implemented as approved. An appropriately qualified and experienced ecological clerk of works must be appointed (or consultant engaged in that capacity) to oversee the ecological mitigation work.

Reason: To ensure that all species are protected having regard to the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 and Policies NC1, NC6, NC7, NC8 and NC9 of the Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan in relation to Nature Conservation and Biodiversity and to meet the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and the NERC Act 2006

143820 - PROPOSED SUBSERVIENT SINGLE STOREY SELF CONTAINED ANNEXE, ANCILLARY TO EXISTING DWELLING HOUSE AT SEFTON COTTAGE, VOWCHURCH, HEREFORD, HR2 0RL

For: Mr Painting per Mr Alex Coppock, Studio 1, The Grange, Shelwick, Hereford HR1 3AW

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

An email clarifying the nature of the structural problems associated with the extension was received on 19 March. This reiterates the need to carry out structural work to protect the existing property and the inherent risk associated with extending the property.

Reference is again made to the need for providing care for the applicant's elderly mother.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

P141368/O - PROPOSED SITE FOR 14 NEW RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES TO INCLUDE 5 NO. AFFORDABLE PROPERTIES, VEHICLE TURNING AND LANDSCAPING AT LAND AT CASTLE END, LEA, ROSS-ON-WYE, HEREFORDSHIRE

For: Bell Homes Ltd per Procuo Planning Services, St Owens Cross, Ross-on-Wye, Herefordshire, HR9 9EF

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

Further letter of objection raising concerns over highway matters including road safety audit.

OFFICER COMMENTS

The further representation has been reviewed by the Transportation Manager who has undertaken further discussions with the applicant Transport Planner. The Transportation Manager is still satisfied that a safe access and pedestrian crossing can be achieved, with appropriate conditions and section 278 Agreement, in accordance with safety standards.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

150373 - PROPOSED ONE AND HALF STOREY EXTENSION (GARDEN ROOM REINSTATED AFTER EXTENSION) AT THE LAURELS, WELLINGTON, HEREFORD, HR4 8AT

For: Mr Willimont per Border Oak Design & Constuction Ltd., Kingsland Sawmills, Kingsland, Leominster, Herefordshire HR6 9SF

OFFICER COMMENTS

Correction to report the dwelling is detached and not semi detached

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

